

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 have been canceled. New claims 25-34 have been added for consideration.

The Examiner has cited prior art by Litvin, Potucek, and Keith in rejecting the claims previously present. These prior art references are all distinguishable from the present invention.

Both of the Keith et al. and Potucek patents teach a nail-like structure with an enlarged head and a pointed end to facilitate penetration. The fundamental difference between the current application and the prior arts lies in the wide-body formation of the claimed connector in the present invention. The connectors of the present invention have longitudinally extending portions that are spaced apart and are connected by an internal web of thinner/equal thickness. Neither of these prior art inventions teach connectors with these longitudinally extending portions.

Potucek describes an improved nail, not a connector. While the nail of Potucek may be used to attach materials to concrete (column 2, lines 28-31), only the shank end of the nail is received in concrete and then it is inserted after the concrete has cured. There is no teaching whatsoever of use of the Potucek nail as a connector where opposite ends would both be embedded in concrete. Potucek neither teaches nor even suggests anything with respect to connectors for concrete sandwich wall panels. Potucek also does not teach “webs” interconnecting longitudinally extending portions. Instead, Potucek teaches barbs 98 that include bights 99 that act to resist retraction of the nail after insertion.

The Examiner has also used the Litvin reference to reject the previously presented claims. As described in response to a previous office action, Litvin et al. teaches a tubing connector 12 of a generally elongated cylindrical configuration that joins together two collinear pieces of hollow tubing 10 and 11 (Fig. 1). The tubing connector 12 has a central rib 19 and a plurality of other ribs 15, 24 and 30 in perpendicular relation and integral with the central rib 19 (Fig. 4). The ribs 15, 19, 24, and 30 are recited to fit into the tubing pieces 10 and 11 in compressed relation, with the outer surfaces of the ribs contacting the inner surfaces

of the tubing pieces 10 and 11 for securely retaining the tubing pieces together (Column 3, lines 14-21).

The use of the Litvin et al. reference as prior art relevant to the present claims is improper. The rib 19 of Litvin is not comparable to the elongated wide body of the present invention. In order to apply Litvin et al. in such a manner, one is required to assume that the ribs 15, 24, and 30 that are perpendicular to and integral with the rib 19 are not present in the disclosure of Litvin et al. It is clear, however, that the tubing connector 12 of Litvin et al. would not work if only the rib 19 were present; the tubing connector 12 would provide very little, if any, support for maintaining alignment of the tubing sections other than in a line generally within the plane of the rib 19. Forces tending to move the tubing sections out of alignment that were outside the plane of the rib 19 would, if of sufficient moment, push the two tubing sections apart. To apply the tubing connector of Litvin et al. as prior art to the present invention requires that it be so mutilated that it will no longer work for its intended function.

Additionally, the Litvin et al. reference is not analogous art. Litvin et al. teaches a connector for hollow tubing, one of the principle features of which is that it can be readily removed if required. No one skilled in the art of making concrete sandwich wall panels would look to the art of removable tubing connectors, which engage the tubing sections only at the inner surface of the sections, when designing a connector that is permanently embedded in concrete and engaging the concrete along all exposed surfaces. requested.

The Examiner is respectfully urged to call the undersigned attorney at (515) 288-2500 to discuss the claims in an effort to reach a mutual agreement with respect to claim limitations in the present application which will be effective to define the patentable subject matter if the present claims are not deemed to be adequate for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Emily Harris", written over a horizontal line.

Date: April 11, 2005

Emily E. Harris
Registration No. 56,201
DAVIS, BROWN, KOEHN,
SHORS & ROBERTS, P.C.
666 Walnut St., Suite 2500
Des Moines, Iowa 50309
Telephone: (515) 288-2500

ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANT